REMARKS

Claims 1-14 and 16-30 were previously pending in this application. No claims are amended herein. As a result claims 1-14 and 16-30 are pending for examination with claims 1, 8, 16, 22, 27 and 28 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 and 16-30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lee (EP 1 017 183 A2). Applicants respectfully disagrees and traverses as follows.

The Examiner cites Lee for the proposition that it "discloses a method for the despreading of spread spectrum signals in a digital signal processor...performed in response to the generation to the single instruction." (Office Action at 2). While Lee does disclose a method for despreading of spread spectrum signals, and does disclose performing certain operations in response to a single instruction, the execution of the single instruction of Lee does not perform the operations required by Applicants' claims to be executed in a single instruction, nor does Lee disclose performing those operations in a single clock cycle, as required by Applicants' claims. Indeed, the system disclosed in Lee performs its operations one symbol at a time and is therefore incapable of performing the operations required by Applicants' claims in response to a single instruction and in a single clock cycle.

Applicants' claims require performing multiple functions in response to a single instruction within a single clock cycle. For example, claim 1 requires a method comprising:

> in response to a single instruction that specifies a plurality of signal values and a plurality of code segments of a despreading code:
>
> complex multiplication of each signal value by a respective one of the code segments to provide a plurality of intermediate results;
>
> complex addition of the intermediate results to provide a despread result; and
>
> storing the despread result, wherein the complex multiplication, the complex addition and the storing of the despread result are executed in a single clock cycle of the digital signal processor.

Lee does not disclose a single instruction specifying a plurality of signal values and a plurality of code segments, nor does Lee disclose performing complex multiplication, addition and storing operations on the plurality of signal values and the plurality of code segments all within a single clock cycle, as claimed.

The "single instruction" disclosed by Lee, and cited by the Examiner, is an instruction that operates on only one symbol at a time. Multiple executions are necessary to arrive at a despread result. As stated in Lee:

> A digital processing device processes the received and buffered symbol data by generating a plurality of single process instructions at least at the data rate of the digital data stream, which a sequence of single process instructions is operable to generate despread symbol data.

(Col. 2, ll. 34-44) (emphasis added). Therefore, Lee does not disclose a single instruction which performs the despread operations of the claims, but rather discloses a system where a plurality of instructions is necessary to perform the despread operation:

> processing the received and buffered symbol data in a digital processing device by generating a plurality of single process instructions at least at the associated data rate, each single process instruction being operable to generate despread data for a given single symbol in the received symbol data;

(Col. 9, ll. 24-30) (emphasis added). See also claims 9 and 16 of Lee.

Furthermore, the despread process taught by Lee does not execute within a single clock cycle as required by the claims but rather, since the instruction of Lee can only operate on a single symbol at a time, the system of Lee takes N clock cycles (where N is the spreading factor) to perform the despreading operation:

> With the specialized architecture disclosed herein, the number of clock cycles could be reduced to N...

(Col. 3, ll. 33-35).

Lee, therefore, does not teach, disclose, or suggest a single instruction, which specifies a plurality of signal values and a plurality of code segments, and performs complex multiplication, addition and storing all within a single clock cycle as claimed. Lee therefore does not teach, disclose or suggest each element of the claims.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,
Rifaat, et al., Applicant

By: _____

Ilan N. Barzilay, Reg. No. 46,540
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2211
Telephone: (617) 720-3500

Docket No. A0312.70412US00
Date: February 6, 2007
x2/6/07